

The Philanthropist.

VOLUME VI. NO. 46.

CINCINNATI, WEDNESDAY, MAY 25, 1842.

WHOLE NO. 206

From the Emancipator and Free American.
VIRGINIA—THE WAR PROSPECT—A
PROTEST.

We have before adverted to the internal division existing in Virginia, in consequence of the irregularity of representation between the Eastern and Western divisions. By the constitution as amended in the convention of 1829, at the dictation of Randolph, Leigh, Tyler, Upshur, and other slaveholders of the old counties, it was established that the representatives should be divided between the districts lying East and West of the Blue Ridge, in the proportion of 78 to the Eastern and 56 to the Western division. And the only way to alter the apportionment was by a vote of two-thirds of each branch of the Legislature in the year 1841, and at intervals of not less than ten years thereafter. Well, the laws of trade and the laws of nature, mock at the arrogance even of the slaveholder and Virginians.—The lapse of a single ten years has brought about so great a change, that, by the late census, the white population of the Western District has already outnumbered that of the East, in the proportion of 371,570 to 269,398. And now the people of the West begin to be puzzled to comprehend the rightfulness of an apportionment, which gives to the East one representative for every 4,736 white inhabitants, and to the West only 1 to every 6,635; or, in other words, makes 8 white men in Eastern Virginia equal to 11 in the West. It is to be borne in mind that the whites alone possess political power.

Well, the representatives from the West made a vigorous effort to obtain some redress or mitigation for this palpable injustice. They boldly declared, that unless they could have an equal share of favor, they would demand a division of the State by the Blue Ridge. Of course, the slaveholders were inexorable, and would concede nothing. How could they concede, when they know that, as soon as they begin to give way, the mysterious charm which sustains the slaveocratic principle is gone, and gone forever? So far from getting a vote of two-thirds in favor of equality, as the constitution requires, a strong majority laid the subject on the table as totally inadmissible. The Western members then, voted down and trampled on, had no resource but in a Protest, and accordingly, on the last night of the session, a few moments before the final adjournment of the House of Delegates, Mr. Armstrong, of Harrison county presented the following, which was read by the clerk and laid on the table without debate, with the consent of the gentleman who presented it.

PROTEST.

"The undersigned, members of the present General Assembly of Virginia, for themselves, and on behalf of their constituents, enter and record their solemn Protest, against the refusal of this General Assembly to execute the authority contained in the fifth section of the constitution of this State, which prescribes that 'the General Assembly, after the year 1841, and at intervals thereafter of not less than ten years, shall have authority, two-thirds of the House concurring, to make re-appointments of delegates and Senators throughout the Commonwealth, so that the number of Delegates shall not at any time exceed 150, nor of Senators, 36.' We also Protest against the refusal to pass a law, providing for taking the census of the people upon calling a convention to amend the Constitution of the State.—Thus deliberately and solemnly denying, in the only two forms in which the inequality of representation throughout the State can be corrected, and refusing to the people the only means of redressing grievances violative of equal freedom, and of those sound principles unanimously affirmed by our fathers, in June, 1776, and re-affirmed by the people of Virginia in convention assembled, in January 1830.

"We, therefore, cherishing, as we do, our love of country—THAT ALL MEN ARE BY NATURE EQUALLY FREE and independent.—That all power is vested in, and consequently derived from the People—and believing, as we do, that all of these fundamental principles, which are embodied in our Declaration of Rights, are grossly violated by the existing apportionment of representation, avail ourselves of the only present right, that of spreading upon the Legislative journal this our Protest:

Signed—
C. P. Dorman, E. J. Armstrong, J. J. Jackson, Samuel Elliot, D. Kinchloe, Philip Cox, Jr., J. F. Harrison, William Jones, V. A. Woodward, Charles Quillen, W. H. French, J. Moler, Jas. W. Newkirk, Presley Martin, William G. Brown, John McPherson, Jefferson T. Martin, George Cowan, Allen T. Caperton, Wm S. Morgan, John McAuley, John M. Robinson, David Pugh, Addison McLaughlin, Geo. Mayes, R. A. Clendenin, J. J. Davis, W. M. Holloway, F. Moore, Wright Gatewood, David Crawford, Nehemiah Smith, Timothy Taylor, John Grimes, Henry Erskine, A. Layburn, John Carroll, J. Mellen, Samuel E. Goodson, H. Bowen, Thomas M. Tate, D. M. Edgington, H. Hiner, Edward P. Hunter, Cromwell Orrick, Jas. C. Shipman, E. H. Smith, Anthony Kennedy, D. Smith, Isaac J. Leflitch.

I give place to these names, because it authenticates more fully the beginnings of what will probably prove to be one of the momentous questions of the day.

A stranger could hardly guess at the reason for this inequality between two sections of the same Commonwealth, by which one part is held in subjection to the other, like Ireland to the British Parliament. Is Western Virginia a conquered province, and are its people ill-affected aliens—that they should be thus held in disgraceful vassalage by a minority? Not at all. Well, then, as Virginia recognises a freehold or other landed qualification for suffrage, is the disfranchised district peopled with minors, or other meretricious operatives, not constitutionally entitled to the exercise of political power? No, for at the Presidential election in 1840, when parties polled their full strength, Eastern Virginia gave 44,362 votes and Western Virginia 42,031, a difference of only 2,331, or 2.7 per cent. of the 86,393 votes given in the State, whereas the difference in their representation is 22, which is 16.4 per cent., or a small fraction less than one-sixth of the whole number of delegates, 134.

In proportion to the representation allowed, Western Virginia ought to have but 31,592 voters, thus leaving 10,438, or one-fourth of their whole number of voters, actually unrepresented in the government of the State. These

10,438 unrepresented Virginians are not less personally worthy and competent to have their influence felt in legislation, than their more favored fellow citizens of the East. Whence, then, the mighty difference, by which the people of one-half of a state are thus arbitrarily shorn of one-fourth of their rightful political power?

The answer is at hand—the favored class, the minority, have the extraordinary political merit of being the holders of 395,250 slaves, while the depressed majority possess but 53,737. The single circumstance that they own slaves more numerous, by 25,852, than themselves, while the others have only one slave to 7 whites, makes all the difference in the world, in the estimate of political merit in a republic.

The usual estimate of the average number of slaves to each owner is 10. By this rule there would be 30,525 slaveholders in Eastern Virginia, which is only 4,837 less than the whole number of their voters, and consequently, it may be boasted that 89 per cent. of those who exercised the right of suffrage are the masters of men. No wonder Mr. Wise spoke of Mr. Webster's Richmond speech as having been delivered in such a presence. Whereas, in Western Virginia, there are but 5,373 slaveholders, which is only 13 per cent. of the whole. Certainly the 36,658 voters who own no slaves ought to be thankful for the privilege of being allowed to live under the government of a slaveryocracy. Giving the slaveholders of the West ten representatives, to which they are entitled by the average allowed to their peers in the East, and the remaining 48 would be one for every 654 voters who are nothing more than common white folks, while the slaveholders have one for every 568 voters.

There is one consideration more, which shows that not only the people of Western Virginia, but the inhabitants of the free states, have a deep interest in the removal of this crying injustice.—The electors of President are chosen by general ticket, and consequently, the vote of a mere white man weighs as much as that of a slaveholder or a slaveholder. But the Senators of the United States are chosen by the legislature, and hence it may happen, in case the freemen of Virginia should ever turn the scale in favor of a President, that the votes of the slaveryocracy in the State Legislature may place men to hold the balance of power in the Senate on the other side, and thus paralyze the administration, & throw public affairs into confusion. But, furthermore, by the Constitution of Virginia, the representatives in Congress are to be chosen by districts, apportioned according to the federal numbers, i. e. adding to the free inhabitants three-fifths of the slaves. In the present Congress, under the apportionment of 1831, the Eastern or minority district has 14 representatives in Congress, while the Western has but seven. But, such has been the comparative effect of liberty and slavery upon the two sections, that under the new apportionment the two districts will stand as 10.5 to 6.5 or in the proportion of 21 to 13. This is unequal enough, to be sure, for each M. C. from the East will represent 4,225 voters, and each one from the West will represent 6,466, which makes two Virginia slaveholders equal to three Virginia freemen, in the councils of the nation.

The question is a grave one, whether those States in which the people choose representatives, to legislate for their interests, have not a right to complain that, in their sister states, the representatives of a class are thrust in to dictate or defeat public measure for their interest and not for the general benefit. What would Virginians do, if the members of Congress from Massachusetts, Rhode Island and New York, were elected under a constitutional provision that made the votes of two inhabitants of a city or manufacturing village equal to the votes of three farmers?

And there is still a graver question, which is, whether Congress has the power to apply a remedy, under that clause of the constitution which says that Congress shall guaranty to each state a republican Constitution. Is this distribution of political power republican? Let the spirit of '76 answer. The Supreme Court of the United States, in their late important decision concerning the surrender of fugitive slaves, have laid down the principle that where the constitution of the United States confers a right, it also, unless expressly forbidden, confers on Congress the power, and imposes the duty, of legislating for the enforcement of that right, nay, the exclusive right of legislation over the whole subject. But that decision was on a different subject, and was designed to restrain the other man's bull, which doubtless makes an odds, yet it will do no harm to think about the matter.

This whole case shows the short-sightedness of statesmen who would frame their policy, and build their hopes of future honor, upon the presumption of the peaceful permanence of slaveryocracy rule in Virginia.

From the N. Y. American.

AMERICAN SLAVES IN ALGERIES.
MR. EDITOR.—Mr. Webster's letter in relation to the Creole has led me to investigate a portion of our history, which may, perhaps, throw some light upon the principles in the present controversy.

From a report made by Mr. Jefferson, when Secretary of State, (30th Dec. 1790) on the Algerians captured some of our vessels and enslaved their crews; and that our ministers then in Europe, "fearing that the captives might be sold, and dispersed throughout the interior and distant countries of Africa," employed an agent to ransom them at \$200 a head. This price was refused, and Congress authorized an offer of \$500. On this, Mr. Jefferson remarked:—"Within the last two or three years, the Spaniards, the Neapolitans and the Russians, had redeemed, at exorbitant prices. Slaves were become scarce, and would hardly be sold at any price." He adds, that the Dey demanded \$2,832 a head for our countrymen; that Spain had paid \$1200, and Russia \$1546 a head.

In 1792, General Washington applied to the Senate to know if they would authorize him to pay \$40,000 for the 13 Algerians held by the Algerines. (p. 108.) They replied, that they would ratify a treaty of peace by which \$40,000 should be paid down, and an annual pay-

ment of 25,000 stipulated for the future. In the meantime, however, the Algerines committed their depredations; and among the documents afterwards submitted to Congress by the President was a letter from a Swedish gentleman at Algiers, in which he says: "I have several times, with tears in my eyes, seen your honest countrymen sinking under the cruel yoke of Slavery." He also announced the melancholy intelligence—"The Algerine corsairs have made ten American prizes, and 105 slaves more." On the 5th of November, 1793, an American agent wrote to General Washington:—"One hundred and five subjects of the United States are employed as captive slaves on the most laborious work; they are in a distressed and naked situation. A petition from these captive slaves was forwarded to Congress, in which they say—"We are employed daily at the most laborious work, without any respect of persons, with six hundred captives of other nations," (p. 337.) and a letter from one of them states that they are kept on "bread and water."

In 1795, the United States, made a treaty with Algiers, and paid \$355,500 for the liberation of these slaves.

In 1802, a Tripolitan Corsair captured the brig Franklin! with a crew of nine men, and carried her into Algiers. Thy Dey, although at peace with us, offered to buy the brig, cargo, and the nine slaves, of the captor; but he refused to sell, and proceeded with them to Tripoli.—[Am. State Papers, vol. IV.]

It seems strange to us, at the present day, to hear white men spoken of as slaves; but it should be recollected, that such alone were the slaves spoken of in Scripture, in those passages which are now frequently quoted in vindication of negro slavery; and also that the serfs of Russia are as white as their owners.

Let us now apply to the American slaves in Barbary, the moral and legal principles applied by Mr. Webster to the negroes of the Creole. The latter we are told "are recognized as property by the Constitution of the United States;" but surely not more explicitly than our countrymen were recognized as property by the Constitution of Algiers. We have seen not only that they were liable to be sold and dispersed through the interior & distant countries in Africa," but also that they were treated much as similar property is treated at home—kept at hard work and with bad fare, and without wages. We have also seen how highly this property was valued, and what enormous prices it actually commanded.

It is certainly a supposable case that these 105 slaves might have been put on board a felucca, with a dozen Moors, to be conveyed by sea to a distant plantation; that seizing a favorable moment they might have made themselves masters of the vessel, excepting sparing the lives of all their guard, and then they would have been discharged a free people into the very midst of them, and then manly rushed upon them with a deadly weapon. We may also suppose that our brave and humane citizens had then proceeded to Gibraltar, where they were kindly received by the officers, who permitted the Moors to take their felucca and go about their business.

The Creole negroes are, according to Mr. Webster, "Mutineers and Murderers." In whatever class of offences we may rank mutiny, Murder we know is a most atrocious crime against which God has denounced the heaviest penalty in this world and the next.—If, therefore, the Creole negroes are murderers, would not our countrymen have incurred the same dreadful guilt, in effecting their escape from slavery by precisely the same means?

The Creole was "carried by violence and crime against the master's will into the port of a friendly power," says the Secretary of State. Great Britain and Algiers were at peace in 1793, of course the felucca would have been carried under circumstances similar to the Creole, "into the port of a friendly power." With great confidence does Mr. Webster proceed: "Certainly ordinary comity and hospitality entitle him (the master of the Creole) to such assistance from the authorities of the place, as should enable him to resume and prosecute his voyage and bring the offenders to justice."—On what possible ground, then, could the authorities of Gibraltar have been excused, had they refused to enable the master of the felucca to carry back to Algiers to slavery and to death one hundred and five American citizens? To this question we can imagine but one possible reply, which is, that the Americans, being prisoners of war, had a moral right to slay their enemies.

This is dangerous ground on which to rest the right of resistance on the part of slaves, for the obvious reason that nearly all the slaves ever imported into our country, were in fact prisoners of war.

True it is, they were not prisoners of war to their successive purchasers, and therefore it may be contended that a sale by the captor gives a valid title to the purchaser, and of course destroys the right of resistance on the part of the slave. Let us, then, vary our supposition a little. We have seen that the American slaves were articles of merchandise among the Barbary Powers. We will suppose these 105 slaves had been sold to the Dey of Tripoli before their escape. They would then have been no longer prisoners of war; but would have been the property of the Dey by a title as scriptural, perfect and indisputable as was that by which every negro on board the Creole was held by his master. In that case, would the guilt of murder have rested on their souls? Would the statesmen of Europe have been justified in branding them as "mutineers and murderers?" Would the authorities at Gibraltar have been guilty of a breach of "ordinary comity and hospitality" for not surrendering them to the "justice" of their Tripolitan master?

I am inclined to believe that, with certain statesmen, a man's complexion makes a wonderful difference in the application of moral and political principles.

For the Massachusetts Spy.
SOUTHERN BANKS.

There has been a great excitement in Philadelphia, in relation to the Banks of the city, producing a severe run upon many of them—not for specie, for that is a commodity that none of them pay out, but for current bills of other banks.—Under the pressure, two of the Banks sunk—the Girard and the Bank of Pennsylvania! The capital of the former was origi-

nally five millions of dollars, and is said to have been held to a great extent by widows and guardians of orphan children, the stock having been considered a peculiarly favorable one for such investments. The Philadelphia Gazette says—"Instances have already fallen under our notice, where widows and orphans have lost their 'all.' It is publicly stated, that 9490 shares are held by females, 2663 in the hands of guardians, 4028 are held by trustees and 335 by benevolent institutions. In amount, over one million, seven hundred thousand dollars."—It is now supposed that the bills will be eventually redeemed, but that the capital stock is nearly all lost. This will occasion much suffering and distress in many families who are thus deprived of their means of support.

The Bank of Pennsylvania was the deposit Bank of the State Government, and about \$800,000 had been deposited therein, a few days before, for the payment of the interest on the State stocks, which fell due on the first inst.—The Bank met all its engagements, till the Governor procured an injunction to prevent its making any further payments. It is said that it had used above one half of the State deposits. This bank, also, it is supposed, will pay all its liabilities except to stockholders for its capital, which is so much impaired that shares which were originally worth but \$500 now sell for but about \$150. The stock of this Bank is held by a more wealthy class than that of the Girard Bank.

The Chesapeake Bank in Baltimore has had a run in consequence of which it was obliged to suspend payment. Of its probable eventual solvency or insolvency we are not informed.—We presume, however, that it is deeply insolvent, as are nearly all the suspended Banks of the South and West, if the claims of the stockholders, for the capital stock, are taken into account. Many of them have already exploded, and will never pay their circulation, and there is no doubt many more will, whenever they are required to resume payment in specie. So long as they redeem only in each others bills, it is easy for them to keep up the appearance of solvency. Two Banks, for instance, in tottering circumstances, will redeem with each others bills, this kind of kite-flying will sustain their credit till people suspect the trick, when all they have to do, is to make a new arrangement of the same kind with other institutions of similar character.

The truth is, that the South is disastrously insolvent, and their insolvency has swept away a great portion of the capital of their own banks, and also of the banks of the States and cities with which they are in the habit of commercial intercourse. Those who trade with the South, and give them credit, may safely calculate, that about as often as once in four or five years, they will have to lose a great portion of the debts then due them. This necessarily follows from the institutions and state of society in that section of the country. It is irreputable for a white person to labor.—Hence, one half of the whole population produces little or nothing, but are the consumers of the labor of the other portion, and larger consumers too, than they would be, were it not for the dissolute and luxurious habits which lives of idleness engender.—It is not only irreputable to labor; but the style of living must be more extravagant than customary with those who do. Another cause of insolvency, is, the extravagant speculation in land and slaves, which want of employment and of other means of subsistence necessarily leads to. It was estimated that the State of Mississippi incurred an indebtedness, in one year, of more than a hundred millions of dollars, for slaves alone, and that, in a little more than a year afterwards, their value diminished nearly one half. Being constantly in debt to the North to a large amount, whenever there is a panic or a pressure, the home debts are secured as far as there is means, and the people of the North have to become the sufferers. By this means the industry of the North is constantly taxed, to make up for the idleness of the South, and the support of the white population in that section of the country is thus divided between the slave laborers of the South & the free laborers of the North, and so it will probably continue to be, so long as the slave system prevails, and the North continues to give cred it to the South as it has heretofore done. When we refuse to do that, it will most essentially shorten the commons of the South; for then they will have to subsist on the labor of the slaves alone.

People often complain of the burthens imposed on them by expenditures for public objects; but the whole taxation for National, State, County and Town purposes, does not probably, bear so heavily on the North, as do the losses sustained in their business intercourse with the South; and if the balance of indebtedness actually due the North, and of which we have been defrauded, could be collected, it is believed that all the personal property of the South would be insufficient for its payment.

Many suppose that because they do not participate in the Southern trade, they do not suffer by the losses which are incident to it.—This is a great mistake. Such are the immutable laws of trade, that these losses become apportioned on the whole productive industry of the community. They diminish by so much, the value of all kinds of labor. The manufacturer of shoes or of any other article, for that matter, is obliged to pay for his labor, his provision, and his stock, as much less than he otherwise could afford to pay, as will insure him against the hazard of loss, and thus it is equalized on every branch of industry.

The mode of doing business for a few years past, has been such as to throw much of these losses on the banks. People at the South have paid for their purchases in Philadelphia, Baltimore &c., in acceptances on time. These are usually discounted by the banks, and thus they become to a considerable extent, the sufferers. We shall not be at all surprised, if it should prove that much the greatest proportion of the suspended banks will be obliged to go into liquidation, and wind up their affairs, with a loss to the Stockholders of the most of their capital.

We declare that we hold the parties with which we have formerly acted, as we hold the rest of our fellow citizens, opponents when they refuse to advocate the right, but when they plead for justice, our friends and co-workers.

RIGHT OF SEARCH.

The following is the concluding part of a very able article in the New York Evening Post, on the right of search. It is from the pen of a highly distinguished lawyer.

Now let us see how the matter stands. The American government insists that in time of peace its vessels are not to be detained or interfered with. The British government concedes this so abundantly as to admit that if an American slave is found with slaves on board, she is to be released.

The British government insists that they have a right to detain and examine the vessels of those nations with whom they have concluded a treaty of search, (as well as their own,) whether they carry a fraudulent flag or not.

The American Minister concedes the right, "provided the interference is not extended to the vessels or citizens of the United States." But it surely can never be that the fact of hoisting an American flag is to be a protection to any pirate or slaver that carries it. This is impossible, and our country would be the last to admit such doctrine. Suppose one of our cruisers pursues a supposed pirate in the Gulf of Mexico, or a supposed slaver on the coast of Africa, and the chase hoists English colors, would the commander of the cruiser even permit his pursuit to be arrested by any such obstacle as this?

But take the other case. An English cruiser, in quest of slaves, overhears a vessel supposed to be a slaver, but which proves to be, in reality, American. Is this, of itself, a national offence? Why, certainly not. It depends on the circumstances of the case—whether there was good cause of suspicion; whether the act was one of wanton aggression, or done in the honest discharge of duty. And more than this—the seizure is undoubtedly made at the peril of the party making it, and of the nation to whom he belongs. The officer would be liable in a civil action for groundless seizure, and the nation for the act of its officer. Such seizure, wantonly made, stupidly made, brutally made, or however made, if unredressed, would undoubtedly furnish the highest reason for national displeasure, and, if repeated, of war. But it can never be, that the mere fact of detaining a vessel on the ground of her being a suspected pirate, or suspected slaver, can be a cause of offence to us as a nation, even if the supposed pirate or slaver may eventually turn out to be an honest, bona fide American merchantman.

The sea is the high road of nations. There is no division of territory to give national character. It must be established by documentary evidence. For what possible object are the papers, (the register of license with which every vessel is provided,) taken but to guard against such contingencies as these? If a vessel, from the ground she cruises on, her build or any other of the indications which the seaman's nice eye, so readily detects, subjects herself to suspicion, she must stand ready to justify her character, by producing her papers and establishing her nationality.

The President has stated the controversy with vastly greater accuracy in his recent message. He says:

"American citizens, prosecuting a lawful commerce in the African seas, under the flag of their country, are not responsible for the abuse, or unlawful use of that flag by others; nor can they rightfully, on account of any such alleged abuses, be interrupted, molested, or detained, while pursuing honest voyages in the usual way, and violating no law themselves, they are unquestionably entitled to indemnity."

Of course, they are entitled to indemnity.—But of what kind, or to what extent? An American vessel is overhauled on the high seas, and compelled to show her papers. They appear satisfactory, and in an hour she is on her way again. What kind of indemnity would be thought worth claiming for a case like this?

Take another case. An American vessel is detained; the papers do not appear satisfactory, and she is carried into port, put to delay and expense, and after all, turns out a bona fide ship of the republic. Take still a third case. An American vessel is arrested by an insolent British officer, the captain is insulted, perhaps maltreated; he is compelled to stop several days to please his captor, and all this without any sufficient reason. Here, in both these last cases, the indemnity doctrine applies, and applies with its rightful force. Such a case, one such case is cause of the highest indignation. Unredressed or repeated in a single instance, and satisfaction should be demanded at the cannon's mouth; the citizen is entitled to full, complete protection; and of all citizens, the sailor's rights, his dignity and interest, should be most carefully watched. If any substantial injury is done to an American vessel, or an American citizen, by the subjects of a foreign power, the American is entitled to indemnity, and it is the duty of the government to insist upon it. To demand an inspection of papers, unaccompanied by insult or delay, is of itself no substantial injury.

And how in the name of astonishment, can Mr. Stevenson say, "that there is no essential difference between the right of search, and that now asserted by her Majesty's government?" The right of search is a right exercised in war, of arresting all neutral vessels, no matter how clear & unquestionable their neutrality; of overhauling their crews, mustering the men, and carrying such of them off as the boarding officer considers British subjects.

The present right is a right of visitation, or inquiry, as it has been termed in an able article on the subject, in a Boston paper, attributed to Mr. Charles Sumner; of inquiry for slaves and slavers, and which pays the most deferential reverence to the American flag, when once ascertained that it is rightfully hoisted.

How these two things can be a moment founded, it is difficult to conceive. But it is said that the right claimed, is liable to abuse—undoubtedly it is, and should be most carefully—zealously watched, and indemnity in all proper cases, rigidly insisted upon. But there are many rights susceptible of abuse, and yet not the less unquestionable. The right of arrest, on suspicion of crime, is one exceedingly liable to be abused; but where it is executed honestly, without unnecessary vexation, does the law inflict damages? Do injuries inflict them on actions of false imprisonment? Certainly not.

If we are to go to war, let us understand what we are fighting about. If it is against the Right of

Search, in defence of our flag, and the safety of our sailors, very well; that is one thing, and no man will be found backward at the muster.—But if it is against the mere right of inquiry—if it is either to enable all the piratical rascals in the world to carry on their infernal livelihood with impunity, or to prevent some dozen or fifty merchantmen, annually from being detained half an hour or half a day through honest error, from a mistaken supposition that they were pirates, that is quite a different matter. The trumpet that bids to that contest, will have rather a lugubrious note.

No blame is to be ascribed to Mr. Stevenson; a foreign minister, contending for his country's rights, had better ask for too much, than too little; but our representative, in this case, has most assuredly demanded, where Great Britain will never concede; and what we, under similar circumstances, would never tolerate.

No particular devotion to Great Britain, animates the writer of these paragraphs. That country—great in her power, great in her intellect, great in her achievements—is controlled by a haughty aristocracy, which has never shown regard or sympathy for our republic. Our institutions are repugnant to them; and they manifest their dislike, both in their official and their private intercourse. So long as the government remains in those hands—so long as their people are animated by these feelings, so long will dislike and distrust chill all the relations between two countries which, by blood and language, are bound so close together.

We have now abundant cause of quarrel with her, without seeking it on the coasts of Africa.—Her course of foreign policy is generally haughty and aggressive. The affair of the Caroline—the pernicious retention of Maine, furnish a thousand-fold better cause for strife, than nineteenth of the wars that have afflicted the race.

Do not then let us, with our eyes open, and with all these ample and sufficient subjects of contest or discussion, allow their statesmen or ours, by craft or blunder, to fasten a quarrel upon us, on a point where our position is totally indefensible.

The owners of slave property, are entitled to all proper assistance in the defence of that property; but let us not raise theoretical points, and argue abstract questions—the only practical effect of which is to promote the infernal traffic in human beings.

If we must have a war, there will be no factious opposition to the government, let the origin of the contest be what it may. No party will shipwreck itself on the rock on which the federalists went down, thirty years ago. But, for the respect of the present and future ages—by our hopes of freedom and our love of God, let us have no war in behalf of the slave-trade.

VETO.

THE PHILANTHROPIST.

EDITED BY G. BAILEY, JR.

CINCINNATI,
Wednesday Morning, May 25, 1842.

FOR GOVERNOR,

LEICESTER KING.

AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION.

We have never insisted on the propriety of making any general movement for amending the Constitution, in those parts relating to slavery. Individuals are not involved in guilt, unless they assent to them, and carry out the obligations, imposed by them, if obligations there be. As a means of exciting discussion in certain cases, and of baffling the despotism of Congress, petitions for such amendments may be started—but, we know of no further good which can result.

All amendments to become valid, must be ratified by three fourths of the states. Suppose then we could unite all the free states upon certain proposed amendments, we should still have to secure the assent of seven slave states. The state of sentiment which would lead them to assent to the wished for alterations, would in all probability be preceded by the abolition of slavery within their limits—and such an event could never take place in seven slave states, without involving a similar result in the rest, and that immediately. So that all such amendments would then be useless.

THE FOUNDATION OF A POLITICAL PARTY.

Human nature is both selfish and social. It is just as much a law of its being, to feel benevolence, as a regard for itself. Hence, in all enterprises, where we wish to engage the co-operation of others, we must address ourselves to their whole nature. He who attempts to succeed, by appealing to man, as a merely mercenary creature, will as certainly undershoot the mark, as he overshoots it, who expends all his persuasion on his disinterested feelings.

Men respond more enthusiastically to appeals to their compassion, sense of justice, love of country, than to arguments directed to their self-interest—though action proceeding from the last, is apt to be more permanent. The orator seldom looks for applause, while engaged in convincing his hearers that a certain measure will conduce to their pecuniary interest; but, when he expatiates on its justice, its tendency to promote the greatness of their country, to mitigate human suffering, to hasten the universal triumph of free principles, if he is a master of his art, what a storm of enthusiasm he wakes up! how he lifts his audience above groveling considerations! for a while, property, life itself shrink into nothingness before the august forms of Truth, Justice and Humanity, which now stand revealed.

These remarks are suggested by an observation made a week or two since, by an esteemed correspondent—that all political parties are ne-

cessarily founded in selfishness; and such too must be the foundation of the Liberty party, if it would hope for success. The assumption is too sweeping. An individual who acts from merely selfish motives, we neither love nor trust. His path will be a downward one, for he carries within himself the most active element of self-deterioration and self-destruction. The same is true of parties. The very reason why political parties have grown so corrupt and abominable, is because the chief element in their composition has been unmixed selfishness, sometimes of the most sordid character.

Which of the two great parties of this country looks to the interests of humanity, on a broad scale—or the influence this country is capable, when properly governed, of exerting in behalf of the cause of Liberty throughout the world? Not one. Is the first, great object of either, the establishment of justice, justice to the black man, as well as the white? Far from it. The claims of justice, the security of personal rights, the true honor of their country, the interests of humanity, scarcely enter into their calculations.

God forbid that such should be the character of the Liberty party! We know that it can appeal with tremendous force to the selfish feelings of the people of the free states. It can show how slavery has encroached on their rights, impaired their political consequence, damaged their pecuniary interests; and this is all right. But, if it stop here, it will but act on the principle our fathers adopted, when they rose against the tyranny of Great Britain.—They fought to secure their own rights, while at the same time they continued their violation of the rights of the colored race. Their selfishness in this particular has entailed on their children a curse, that may yet destroy the result of all their struggles.

Shall the Liberty party pursue the same policy? Never! Its first great object should be, the establishment of justice. It should respect man, as man, irrespective of his condition; where it has the power, secure his rights against encroachment, and, where it has no positive power, contribute all it can, by moral influence, to this end. It should regard national welfare as the consequence of national well-doing.—Nor should its views be confined to this country. Man every where should be an object of its solicitude. It should seek to place this Union in such an attitude before the world, as would promote the cause of free principles, and meliorate human suffering, in every legitimate way.

Let us then appeal to every natural principle in human nature. By all means, show the ruinous effects of slavery on the interests of the white man—but, do not forget to place our enterprise on a higher ground—the ground of equal and exact justice to all men, the recognition and treatment of man, as man, irrespective of clime, color or condition.

THE U. S. & GREAT BRITAIN.

Mr. Webster has addressed a letter to the Governor of Massachusetts and Maine, informing them that Lord Ashburton is invested with full power to negotiate and settle the different matters in discussion between the two countries—and that, in regard to the Boundary question, he is empowered to treat for a conventional line, or line by agreement, on such terms and conditions, and with such mutual considerations and equivalents, as may be thought just and equitable. Under such circumstances, the President has thought proper to call the attention of the two states to the subject, and desire their co-operation.

The cost and delay of an additional survey of the territory in dispute, and its settlement by arbitration, are urged as reasons, for listening with favor to the proposition. The Governor of Massachusetts, it seems, is already authorized by resolutions of the Legislature, to do whatever may be necessary—and Governor Fairfield of Maine has issued a proclamation convening the Legislature of that state on the 18th inst.

Every true patriot must rejoice at the brightening prospect of preserving peace between two countries, allied by so many ties.

TARIFF.

The Secretary of the Treasury has transmitted to Congress, the scheme of a revised tariff, in which the duties are increased on wool, manufactured and unmanufactured, cotton, cottons, hemp, iron, leather, boots shoes &c.

The *ad valorem* standard is in some cases abandoned for specific duties—and where *ad valorem* duties are preferred, the foreign value of the articles is taken as the basis.

The Secretary estimates the expenditures of the government for the years '42 '43 and '44 at an aggregate of \$98, 242,953.73. The primary object of the bill is, to raise an amount of revenue, supposed to be commensurate with the wants of the government—and a secondary object, to afford some relief to the laboring classes, and mechanical trades of the country.

A motion to refer the report to the committee of the whole on the state of the Union, failed, which Mr. Everett considered equivalent to a declaration that there should be no tariff act before the 1st July. The report was then referred to the committee of ways and means.

FAVORITISM.

During the debate on the Naval Appropriation Bill, in the House of Representatives on the 13th, Mr. Everett of Vt., called the attention of members to the favoritism which had been manifested by the Administration, in the appointment of midshipmen &c. During the late Administration, he had applied for a poor orphan boy, and received some encouragement. He subsequently renewed his application, but was told the situation was all full. On the change of Administration, he applied to Mr. Badger, but was informed that a surplus of appointments had been made by the preceding Administration. From the present Secretary he had, received an answer that his application

should be most respectfully considered. Since then 168 midshipmen had been appointed, but his poor orphan boy was not among the number. From the 4th of March, 1841, to the 8th of April last, the whole number appointed had been 158; of whom 31 were from Virginia, 20 from the District of Columbia, and 19 from Maryland; and of 85 other appointments, 18 had been from Virginia, 9 from the District of Columbia, and 4 from Maryland,—giving to Virginia 49, to the District of Columbia, 29, and to Maryland, 23; making 101 out of 253 appointments.

Mr. Brown alluded to the fact of his having received information from the Secretary of the Navy, that an apprentice or a sailor boy could not under the regulations of the service, be made an officer. Mr. B. protested against such a regulation as anti-republican. We think so too.

Mr. Morgan said that he had also prepared a statement.

It appeared, Mr. M. remarked, from document 173, that, according to the last census, the number of midshipmen to which Virginia was entitled, was 11.2 while 15 were appointed from that State.

New York was entitled to 21 and only 17 were appointed. There were 32 appointments of midshipmen, in large. Of this number 15 were from Virginia, 8 from Maryland, and 4 from the District of Columbia; Making 27 out of 32, from Virginia and Maryland, including the District.

Of 9 assistant surgeons, 4 were from Virginia, 2 from Maryland, and only 1 from the free States. Of 11 pursers, 3 were from Virginia and 4 from free States. Of 12 chaplains, 2 were from Virginia and 8 from free States. Of 168 midshipmen, 35 were from Virginia, 16 from Maryland, and 15 from New York; 54 were from the free States.

As regarded midshipmen, he (Mr. M.) had been placed in the same situation as the gentleman from Vermont, (Mr. Everett.) He (Mr. M.) had made application to the Secretary of the Navy under the last Administration. He had repeated his application to the two last Secretaries; and for two years he had been told that all the appointments had been filled. Yet he knew that appointments had been made for Virginia since his application made for New York. It was time that the attention of the country should be called to this favoritism, and that Virginia should receive no more than a fair proportion to others, at all events, of those which belonged to the Navy.

We are glad to see this system of pro-slavery favoritism arresting the attention of members of Congress.

It would be difficult to say what special excellence there is in slaveholder's sons, to entitle them to a monopoly of such offices.

LETTER OF THE PRESIDENT.

Affairs in Rhode Island wear a warlike aspect. The Free Suffrage men appear determined to assert their rights by force, while on the part of the constituted authorities, no conciliatory disposition is manifested. Another letter from the President, to the Governor of Rhode Island, dated May 7th, has appeared, in which he terms the convention of Free Suffrage men, "lawless assemblages," and announces his determination to sustain by the force of the United States, the constituted authorities. He very truly says, that "changes achieved by regular and, if necessary, repeated appeals to the constituted authorities, in a country so much under the influence of public opinion, and by recourse to argument and remonstrance, are more likely to insure lasting blessings, than those accomplished by violence and bloodshed, on one day, and liable to overthrow by similar agents on another." But, we know not why the United States may not remonstrate with the charter party of Rhode Island, or constituted authorities—for it is their obstinacy, if we understand the question, that has brought about this deplorable crisis. The same clause which binds them to put down domestic violence in any state on proper application, pledges them to guaranty to every state, a republican form of Government. But we cannot see what republicanism there is, in one half of the adult male population of a state, depriving the other half of political rights. We deeply regret the recourse of the people of Rhode Island to arms, but we still say, let the blame be put on the right shoulders.

THE RHODE ISLAND DIFFICULTIES.

It is well known to our readers, that serious disturbances have lately taken place in Rhode Island, caused by the dissatisfaction of a large portion of the people of that State with its present form of Government. This is no other than that contained in the charter, granted by Charles II; and it is justly complained of, as being unequal and anti-republican. So far as we can learn, a majority of the people of the State is deprived of the right of suffrage. We abridge from the New York Evening Post, a list of grievances, which the people wish to redress.

No man, not a freeholder, can vote for a town or state officer, for members of Congress, or a President of the United States.

He may, on complaint of any two freeholders, be compelled to quit the State at 26 hours warning; and, if he refuses, be flogged at the public whipping post, and then forcibly ejected.

He is subject to taxation, and the performance of military duty, and is enrolled among freemen, and yet has no vote in any instance. He is by law incompetent to sit inquest between man and man. He can have no access to the courts of justice, unless endorsed by freeholders, and cannot become bail.

These are but a few of the grievances, and surely they are detestable enough. Against them, the disfranchised portion of the people have protested again and again, and demanded without ceasing the acknowledgment of their just rights; but the established government has been stubborn. And now, as a last resort, the right of revolution is asserted. The free suffrage party, declared to be the majority, have held a convention, adopted a Constitution, elected officers under it, and assumed that theirs, is the rightful government of the state; while the charter government maintains its prerogatives. Application has been made by the original authorities to the Executive of the United States, and he has indicated his purpose to sustain them, in accordance with sect. 6th, Art. 10, of the federal constitution.

We cannot too strongly express our detestation

of the principles & policy of the Charter party in Rhode Island. If strife should ensue & blood be shed, they should be held chiefly responsible for all. Their form of government is anti-republican—it involves the very principle which the colonies contended against, when they threw off the British yoke—"taxation without representation." We may quibble as much as we choose about the right of suffrage, and argue against it, on the ground, that all unite in denying it to women and minors. Common Sense supposes, as a general thing, that minors are not capable of self-government, and we have infallible authority for assuming that man and woman as generally found in society, are but one. But, that there should be any inequality made in the political rights of adult males, full grown men, equal in natural rights, seems to us to strike at the very foundation of democracy. The fundamental idea of a democracy is, equality of rights. If we are to have a democracy, let the idea be faithfully carried out. What more palpably unjust and absurd, in a community professing to believe that all men are created equal, possessed of the same rights, than to see one half of it, withholding from the other half all right to participate in making the government, electing the officers, and enacting the laws, under which they must live!

As to the right of the disfranchised people of Rhode Island to resist the established government, an interesting discussion has arisen, the democratic papers generally defending, the whig papers, denying it. If the Declaration of Independence, and the example of the thirteen Colonies, be taken as authority, the case is very plain.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal—that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that when any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such forms, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their happiness and safety."

The right of revolution is here distinctly asserted—and it ill becomes Americans, who owe their existence as an independent nation to the enforcement of this right, to deny it. The cause, which justifies the exercises of the right, is also clearly pointed out:—"Whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends"—which are, the maintenance of man's natural equality in rights, and the security of the rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

But in whom resides the right of revolution? In the "people." "It is the right of the people" &c. But who are the "people?" A majority? If this was meant, then our fathers said nothing that would justify them in revolting against Great Britain—for theirs was the resistance of the minority against the majority.—They must then have intended to assert that the right of revolution was inherent in a majority or a minority of the people, whenever the form of government became destructive of the ends above referred to.

We are not responsible for this doctrine—it is the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence, that on which our national existence is predicated.

The consequences are of vast importance.—If it be true, then, for causes similar to those which generated the Revolution, the people of this Union, or of the several States, that is, a majority or minority of the people of the Union, or of any particular state—have a right to alter or abolish, so far as they are concerned, the government under which they live. In this matter, the majority or minority is responsible to no human tribunal—it acts for itself, act on its responsibility to the God of nations.

Therefore, any state, or number of states in the Union, when the federal government becomes destructive of the inalienable rights of their citizens, has the right to throw off all allegiance to that government, and erect a new Union, "laying its foundations on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their happiness and safety."

Hence the disfranchised people of Rhode Island, whether they be a minority, or majority, have a right to throw off the government, if it has become destructive of the ends, spoken of in the Declaration of Independence. And here we would ask, can the power of the United States rightfully used against a people, who are really acting under the sanction of a principle, on which our existence as a nation is justified? On the contrary, when called upon to suppress domestic violence, is it not the first duty, to ascertain the causes of the violence; and, if they be justly chargeable on the anti-republican operations of the established government, is it not the duty then of the United States to suppress the violence by aiding in the removal of its causes, and in the language of the Constitution itself, to guarantee to the state a republican form of government.

So far as we can learn, the democratic papers of the free states sustain the right of the people of Rhode Island to resist the established authorities, and revolutionize the government—and denounce any interference on the part of the United States to prevent this result.

If the democratic party could lay claim to much consistency, slaveholders might well shrink from it, as a most dangerous ally. For the ground on which it justifies the Rhode Islanders, will warrant an insurrection of the slave population in every slave state in the Union.

We have spoken of the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and the example of the thirteen colonies, in their bearings on

the case of Rhode Island. Let us examine them under another aspect. Suppose a revolt of the slaves of South Carolina. They constitute a large majority of the people of the State. In revolting, they exercise not only a right, but perform a solemn duty. Such is the testimony of our fathers—such the doctrine of the charter of our national existence—such the doctrine on which the Democrats sustain the people of Rhode Island. Human governments, say our fathers, "derive their just power from the consent of the governed." No one will pretend, that the 327,000 colored people of South Carolina have ever consented to the government established over them by the 250,000 white people. The people have a right, say our fathers, to abolish any form of government, whenever it becomes destructive of the principle of equality or the inalienable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.—That is, the people, whose rights are thus destroyed. They must mean this, or they talk nonsense. They are still more explicit. "When a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security." In the case supposed, respecting the 327,000 colored people of South Carolina, this design had been completely accomplished; and will any one now dare deny, that our fathers, the delegates from the original colonies, who in Congress assembled put forth this declaration to the world, have entirely justified the supposed revolt of these 327,000 colored people of Carolina? But one objection can be urged against this application of their doctrines—and that is, that the rights of men are changed by their complexion. The man who would start such an objection as this, has neither sense nor humanity enough to entitle him to be reasoned with. He is simply a fool, and his heart is as much at fault as his head.

And in the case of the supposed revolt, we would inquire, as in the case of Rhode Island—what would be the duty of the United States when called on to suppress the violence?—Would it not be bound to look into the causes of it, in order to determine whether these causes were not chargeable on the anti-republican, despotic character of the form of government? And, if such should prove the fact, would not its duty be, to aid in removing these causes, and thus fulfil the pledge of the Constitution, which binds it to guarantee to every State in this Union, a republican form of government?

Our readers see how vastly important are the principles involved in this Rhode Island controversy. We may resume the consideration of it at a future time.

POLITICAL Elections.

The Liberty men in Connecticut have elected two members of the Legislature—in New Hampshire, 12 members.

New York shows a fine increase in the local elections, of the Liberty Ticket. By the reports from ten towns furnished in the Madison County Abolitionist, we see that the Liberty vote which last year stood, 175, has increased to 525.

In Michigan, the increase is rapid. Last fall, Columbia and Napoleon, two towns, gave some 22 votes—in the late election, they gave 110 for the Liberty men.

In Commerce, Oakland county, 162 votes were canvassed, 41 Liberty. Last fall, there were but 7.

In Adams, Hillsdale co., both the old parties voted against the Liberty men, but were defeated—the Liberty ticket succeeded.

In Flint, Genesee co., the same game was played—neither party being sufficiently strong, single handed, to cope with the Liberty men—and in Genesee, both united, triumphed by a majority of only 16 over the Liberty men.

In Bridgewater, Washtenaw co., they have increased from 7 last fall to 20 this spring—and by next fall calculate to double their numbers.

In Warren city, Branch co., every candidate on the Liberty ticket was elected.

These are mere specimens. They show the importance of attending to the local elections—and the rapidity of the growth of the Liberty party.

Indiana.

Our friend Arnold Buffum, is indefatigable. The abolitionists in Indiana appear to be all Liberty men. We see notices of nominating conventions, in Wayne, Henry, and Grant counties—the first to meet at Centerville, the 26th inst.; the second, at New Castle, on the 28th inst.; and the third at Marion on the 4th June.

The anniversary of the State Society will be held on the 5th September, at New Garden, Wayne county. The first anniversary of the Indiana State Wesleyan Anti-slavery Society will be held at Centerville on the last Thursday of May.

A State Liberty convention will be held at New Garden, 5th of September next. Our Indiana friends are in earnest.

Illinois.

The late Peoria Gazette contains a column or two of notices of the proceedings of anti-slavery men in that State. The Liberty men of Bureau co. have nominated their candidates, to be supported at the August election. One of them, Mr. Bryant, brother of the editor of the New York Evening Post, has been a democrat; the rest of the nominees have been whigs.

The right of free discussion is not yet established in Illinois. The Gazette gives two accounts, one from anti-abolitionists, the other from Rev. Mr. Dickey, of certain exciting proceedings in Washington, Tazewell county. There is little discrepancy between the two. The following is Mr. Dickey's account.

"On the same day Herod and Pilate were made friends," Mr. Dickey.

I had fondly hoped that the reign of mobocracy was over, and that the liberty of discussion would be maintained by our citizens generally; but I have found at least one exception. The mob rules at Washington. Leaving to others to give a full account of the proceedings, I hasten to send you a sketch of the passing events of the day.

About a month ago I received notice that the Tazewell county anti-slavery society was to hold its quarterly meeting on Saturday, the 7th of May, and that I was requested to attend and give the Bible view of servitude. Notice was accordingly given to that effect, and that Mr. Allen, of Peoria, would address the meeting on the duty of Christians with reference to that subject. I felt pleased to have an opportunity of vindicating my faith from what I conceived to be a slander upon that holy book, viz: that it authorized slaveholding. I appeared at Peoria on the evening before the meeting, in company with Bro. Lovejoy of Princeton. There we met three men of the neighborhood, professing to be friends, who informed us that there would be determined opposition to the meeting. We learned also that an anti-abolition meeting had been held in the Methodist church, in which Rev. R. H. Moffat, the preacher in charge, presided; by which it was resolved that measures should be taken to prevent the abolition meeting, and that "should the abolitionists persist in holding their meeting, and evil result, such evils may be chargeable to their rashness." Previously the public mind had been prepared by a discourse by Elder Chase, in which he attempted to prove that the Bible authorized slavery; and said that such was the exciting nature of the doctrine of abolition, he did not know but that a thorough-going abolitionist would, on occasion, a most anxious man—where the abolitionists were themselves moderate and duty of abolitionism should be treated as the "fox" that was wont to push, he did not care.

Another meeting was held in the school-house in Washington on Wednesday, in which a resolution passed, by a vote of 23 to 8, that if the anti-slavery meeting could not otherwise be prevented, it should be prevented by violence.

Having prayed for direction, and committed the cause to the care of our heavenly father, we laid us down and slept secure.

In the morning we were waited on by five others, who, in their solicitude, entreated us not to venture into the town—that the mob were collecting, furnished not only with eggs and tar, and feathers, but with muskets and other weapons of death, and actually showed us a specimen of their balls, that were to hurl destruction to the abolitionists. We however did not feel at liberty to abandon our rights on a mere rumor of danger, and proceeded into town. There we found the Presbyterian meeting house, where the meeting was to be held, surrounded by a mob—full of over 1000. In this company were recognized several who had pledged themselves to use violence if necessary.

The house had been granted to the anti-slavery society by the consent of the trustees, three to one. That one trustee had, with others, nailed up the door of the house—that morning. How the mob got in we know not. A Mr. Snell, of Washington, is reported to have said he was authorized by one of the trustees to open the door, with a charge to keep out the abolitionists. In some way they gained admittance, and Dr. Burton moved to organize by putting Mr. Moffat in the chair. On his refusing, the motion was changed to Mr. Holland, and he was chosen. A motion was made to appoint five persons to be a committee of vigilance, to watch the motions of the abolitionists, & not to suffer them to meet anywhere within the corporation; which motion was supported by Elder Chase. Thus every thing was done in order.

In this state of things the abolitionists came on. And here let me say, the ladies deserve praise for their prompt attendance. The committee of vigilance met us before the door, admonished us of the state of things, and, in the name of the company occupying the house, requested us to retire and give up our meeting. They were informed that we could not consent to sign away our own privileges; but if they said we should not hold our meeting, we would not oppose force to force. This committee went back for further orders, and returned and aver that we could not hold the meeting within the corporation. We then retired into the street, and the president called the attention of the society. And, on motion, the society adjourned to meet at Pleasant Grove, at 3 o'clock P. M. We had a very full and interesting meeting, and received 12 or 15 new members. These were some of the first fruits of mobocratic violence. One of them had been well edged the night before. Another had been kept out of the meeting house on a suspicion that he was not sound at the core, and advised to leave by one holding the commission of a magistrate. I understand they say we are much indebted to one of the many thanks that we were not injured. I hope we do thank Him who makes the wrath of man to praise him, and restrains the remainder of it.

It was a motley group—made up of preachers and profane swearers, professors and infidels, men of property and standing, and ragged boys, all huddled together. Strange amalgamation! "And the same day Pilate and Herod were made friends together," Yours, J. H. DICKEY.

May 9, 1842.

The Gazette censures the mob, very justly—but he thinks the abolitionists are to blame. Certainly, their conduct was entirely temperate, and reasonable. It was not for them to abandon their rights—and they acted properly in throwing the whole responsibility of violating the law and constitution, on the people of Washington. The Devil was in the people, and it was a useful thing to make the fact manifest both to themselves and others.

Ohio.

Our anniversary, we think, will be well attended. Friend Smith of the Spirit of Liberty, who was with us at our anniversary last year, and did so much service, will be present at the approaching one. He is a host in himself. But he ought to quit the tripod. "The Spirit of Liberty" does not give him room enough. Editing don't suit his genius half so well as speaking.

The Liberty men are beginning to call their nominating conventions. One, we see, announced for May 25th, at the centre of Vienna, Trumbull county, for the purpose of nominating a ticket, "to be composed of men who are openly and firmly opposed to the unjust influences of slavery on our governments, both state and national." By the way, slavery has no just influence whatsoever.

We hope the Liberty men will be active. They are no longer the third party, but the first. They were first in the field with their candidate for Governor—let them be first with the other candidates.

The editor of the Dayton Empire, a Democratic paper, says—"we were really astonished in travelling through the northern part of the state, to find such a vast number of King men. The King party is composed of 1st, abolitionists proper; 2nd, of luke-warm, disgusted and discouraged whigs; 3rd, of—to some extent—no party men,"—and he might have added, 4th, of disgusted democrats.

The following has been handed to us by a correspondent.

"THE BALL ROLLING IN BUTLER COUNTY."

Two Liberty meetings were held in Butler County on Tuesday of last week—the first at the Court House in Hamilton at 2 o'clock P. M. the second at the Presbyterian church in Ross-ville in the evening, and both were well attended considering the limited notice given. At both meetings spirited addresses were delivered by Messrs. Brisbane, Chase and Moore. Dr. Brisbane, a native of South Carolina, and formerly a slaveholder, exhibited in a strong light the intolerance and grasping spirit of the Slave Power. Mr. Chase pointed out the inconsistency of slavery in the District of Colum-

bia, in Florida and in American vessels on the high seas with the Constitution of the United States and with the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and portrayed the dangers to which the liberties of the people, the best interests of the country at home and the honor of the nation abroad were exposed by the encroachments of the Slave Power. Mr. Moore having declared himself to be a practical mechanic and an ardent democrat, exposed the degrading influence and ruinous effects of slavery on free labor, and held up to just contempt the inconsistency of the professions of trading politicians with their performances, and showed the necessity of having a party, not merely professing but practising democracy—in other words, a genuine LIBERTY PARTY.

At the close of the second meeting a county committee was appointed for Butler county to circulate the Liberty Roll for signatures and to promote, otherwise, the success of the Liberty Party. This committee consists of Dr. Cooper, Stephen E. Griffin and Joseph R. Howells, and will doubtless prove active and efficient. There is work enough for them to do in Butler County.

Two incidents are said to have occurred, perhaps worth mentioning. The first is, a venerable old man, at the close of Mr. Moore's plain and earnest remarks, involuntarily exclaimed loud enough to be heard by those around him, "Well, my friend, I am willing to say what I think, and that is that you are a great deal more honest than any of the politicians we have nowadays." The other is, some democrats were heard talking in the streets about Mr. Chase's speech, when one remarked to the others, "The only way to get over that argument is to jump over it."

Who will roll on the ball in other counties?

LIBERTY MEETING IN STORR'S TOWNSHIP.

A public meeting was addressed on the principles and objects of the Liberty Party, at the New Chapel on the River Road, in Storrs Township, on Monday evening last by Mr. Chase. The meeting, though not large, was highly respectable; and the speaker is said to have succeeded in abating the prejudices and correcting the erroneous impressions of at least a portion of his auditors, in regard to the purposes and doctrines of the Liberty Party. When will all understand that the principles of the LIBERTY PARTY are the principles of the Constitution and that its object is to restore prosperity and liberty to the country, now deprived of both by the usurpations and encroachments of the Slave Power.

Judge King.

We are happy to announce, that Judge King will visit the State generally this summer, and explain and vindicate to the people, the principles and policy of the Liberty Party. It is the intention of Mr. Samuel Lewis, and, we believe, of Mr. Thomas Morris, to do likewise.

A correspondent very truly says, that "with the present organization of political parties, and the pulpit and press against us, we can only reach the people by public addresses to them in their primary assemblies. If we can succeed in obtaining their attention, the battle will be half won."

APPORTIONMENT BILL.

Mr. Berrien from the Judiciary Committee in the Senate has reported the Apportionment bill with an amendment, which is, to strike out "one hundred and seventy-nine, so as to leave the ratio, 50,000. The bill has not yet been acted on.

THE FLORIDA NEGRO HUNT.

The President has announced by message to Congress that the Florida war (?) has ended. But one or two hundred warriors now remain in the territory, and it is supposed inexpedient to keep several thousands of Uncle Sam's troops there to contend with them. An armed occupation is now talked of, and it is supposed the rest of the Indians can be exterminated! So much for the National Negro Hunt. As a neighbor is accustomed to say, it will constitute a curious chapter for the future historian.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

This bill has passed both Houses, and by this time has probably become a law.

INFLUENCE OF PRECEDENTS.

"Things had begun, make strong themselves by ill." That vicious compromise of the Constitution respecting the ratio of representation has been a fruitful source of compromises most injurious to the free states. The true ground for determining how officers shall be distributed among the several states, is undoubtedly their free population—for slaves are chattels, and can have nothing to do with office.

On the 14th, Mr. Graham of North Carolina, offered in the House of Representatives the following resolution, which was adopted.

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs be instructed, to inquire into the expediency of passing a law, or establishing some uniform rule for giving to each State, Territory, and the District of Columbia its equal share of officers and midshipmen in the Navy, according to the ratio of the next representation in the House of Representatives under the sixth census, so that all of the States and parts of the Union shall enjoy equal rights and equal advantages in proportion to their federal population.

The effect of this would be, that Ohio, with its white population of 1,500,000, could furnish no more officers nor midshipmen to the navy, than the states of Alabama, South Carolina, Mississippi, and Louisiana, which altogether contain, not quite one-half the number of her free population! That is to say, the children of seven hundred thousand slaveholding population, shall have twice as many chances for advancement in the navy, as the children of the hard working people of Ohio.

But, the regulation would be unwise on other accounts. The sea-board states, for obvious reasons, ought to furnish a greater supply of officers and midshipmen in the navy. They produce the great majority of the sailors. Their people are more addicted from necessity to a sea-faring life; and it is to be supposed that the youth of the sea-board states will be better qualified, both by habit and inclination, to fill with usefulness such stations in the navy.

NOTICE.

The Anti-slavery Concert of Prayer will be held on next Monday evening, in the basement of Mr. Blanchard's church. May 25th, 1842.